UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,487	09/21/2004	Khamir Girish Joshi	04-11	5486
	7590 06/25/201 OWN & ROOT LLC	EXAMINER		
ATTN: Christia		SINGH, SUNIL		
4100 Clinton Drive HOUSTON, TX 77020			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3672	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/25/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

IPLegal@kbr.com valerie.driver@kbr.com alice.alford@kbr.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/711,487	JOSHI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Sunil Singh	3672	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the	cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 03 June 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION	IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same of application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with application for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. periods: 	an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the beal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final r	ejection
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX	n, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CF MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	IECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and tunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened state set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	he corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee tutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	216 07 OFD 44 07 m of he filed 200 of the committee of the
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>03 June 2010</u> . A brief in complian date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with <u>AMENDMENTS</u>	n thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to	the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration	and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal; and/or 	appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a correspondi	ng number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See atta	ched Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if so non-allowable claim(s).	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	
Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected:	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or expressions are supplied to the first of the file of	on the data of filing a Notice of Annual will not be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was n	rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. \square The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the starREQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	us of the claims after entry is below or attached.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT See Continuation Sheet.	place the application in condition for allowance because:
12. \square Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08	3) Paper No(s)
13. Other:	
10	unil Singh/
	mary Examiner, Art Unit 3672
• • •	,

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claims 61 was rejected as new matter because the drawings and specification were amended to provide basis for claim 61. Applicant argues that the examiner fails to clearly explain the references. The examiner disagrees. See final office action mailed 3/3/10. Applicant argues that Moses et al. fail to teach a buoyant coating. According to Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary tenth edition and Dictionary reference.com, Coating is defined as "to cover with a coat". Coat is defined as "a layer of anything that covers a surface". Therefore, Moses et al. teach a buoyant coating as pointed out in Final office action (3/3/10). Applicant argues that the prior art fail to teach the flexure control to be located either proximate or distant to an edge of a topographic feature. The examiner disagrees. Clearly in the Final Office action (mailed 3/3/10), it is pointed out in Richmond et al. where the first/second unbuoyed pipeline meet the distributed buoyancy region. Brown as depicted in Figure 6 shows that the first/second unbuoyed pipeline meet the distributed buoyancy region proximate or distant to an edge of a topographic feature. Therefore, upon modifying Richmond et al. as modified by Brown (as discussed in final of 3/3/10) the flexure control device taught by Moses et al. would be positioned proximate or distant to an edge of a topographic feature.

/Sunil Singh/